



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/740,780	12/19/2000	Gang Hu	JA9990262	5406

7590 03/09/2006

Floyd A. Gonzalez
IBM Corporation - IPLaw
2455 South Road - MS P386
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601

EXAMINER

SERROU, ABDELALI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2654

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/740,780

Applicant(s)

HU ET AL.

Examiner

Abdelali Serrou

Art Unit

2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 December 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In response to the office action from 07/14/2005, the applicant has submitted an amendment, filed on 09/02/2005, amending claims 1, 11-13, 23-25, and 35-36, and adding claim 37.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments about the original limitations have been fully considered, but are not persuasive.

3. As per claims 1 and 13, Applicant argues (page 11-12) that Kozma uses "external knowledge" instead of contextual knowledge, stating that the "external knowledge" of Kozma is not contextual. Examiner, respectfully, disagrees and notes that, for translation and word disambiguation, Kozma uses contextual knowledge (ambiguity may be resolved by referring to the context of the ambiguous expression, col. 3, line 49-50), and Kozma does disclose additional contextual information that is located separately from the other semantic information (col. 4, line 3-5). Furthermore, the "external knowledge" of Kozma means "Externally derived information" and not a context free information.

Applicant argues (page 13) that the use of links, for providing extra translation information, taught by Chanond is not "additional context", stating that this extra translation information is more related to aspects of a "word analyzer". Examiner, respectfully, disagrees and notes that, the extra translation information is an additional context that used to generate words translation and disambiguation, and in order to extract the meaning or the concept of a

Art Unit: 2654

word, it is well known in the art of linguistic, that the “word meaning analyzer” analyzes the text surrounding the word of interest. Otherwise, a full meaning or concept of a word would not be obtained. Therefore, the combination and the motivation of the combination of Kozma and Chanond are valid and do overcome the applicant’s arguments.

4. As per claims 3, 15, and 27, Applicant argues, insisting again on Chanond’s hyperlinks as being not contextual links. Examiner, respectfully, disagrees for the same reasons as set above in paragraph 3.

5. As per claims 11, 12, 23, 24, 35, and 36, Applicant requests (page 15) the examiner to provide evidence of information links within the same webpage or in a different webpage. The reference of evidence is: Mayer (U.S 6,282,511, filed on Dec. 4, 1996), (col. 3, line 29-39).

The amended office action is given bellow.

Claim Objections

6. Claims 1 and 13 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 1 and 13 should be labeled as “currently amended”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2654

8. Claims 1-4, 6-16, 18-28, and 30-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kozma (U.S. 5,983,169 issued on Feb. 9, 1999) in view of Chanod (U.S. 6,269,189 filed in Nov. 29, 1998 and issued on Jul. 31, 2001).

9. As per claims 1, 13, and 25, Kozma teaches:

a method, system, and computer readable medium for translating a first text in a first language to a second text in a second language (machine translation system, col. 2, line 36);

analyzing a first phrase in its immediate context in the first text for the existence of a first translation to a unique phrase in the second text in the second language and translating the first phrase to a unique second phrase in the second text if the first translation is found to exist (col. 6, lines 37-42);

translating the first phrase to a second phrase using the additional context “external knowledge”(col. 4, line 1) obtained from a second text if the first translation is not found to exist (in the case of “the mother of the boy and the orphan”, col. 3, line 64, the system used additional information to define the “orphan” and therefore provide the right translation).

However, Kozma does not teach obtaining additional context using a link related to the first text if the unique phrase is not found.

Chanod, however, teaches an annotation system (col. 17, lines 56-57), suggesting the use of links, for providing extra translation information to the user (hyperlinks, providing the user with translations, col. 17, lines 56-66).

Kozma and Chanond are analogous art because they are from the same art of extracting information.

Art Unit: 2654

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have added Chanond's feature of extracting information through hyperlinks to the translation system of Kozma, to have "interactive aids for consulting on-line documents" to clarify ambiguous words, as taught by Chanond (col. 17, lines 18-26)

10. As per claims 2, 14, and 26, Kozma teaches a translation machine wherein the first phrase is a word (col. 6, lines 14-15).

11. As per claims 3, 15, and 27, Kozma does not teach hyperlinks in HTML code.

However, Chanond do teach an annotation system (col. 17, lines 56-57), wherein he uses hyperlinks in HTML code (col. 14, lines 25-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have added Chanond's feature of using hyperlinks in HTML code to the translation system of Kozma to provide to access to help information from on-line multi-documents.

12. As per claims 4, 16, and 28, the examiner takes official notice that it's well known that PDF files, Lotus Notes files, Lotus Word Pro files, Microsoft Word files and Microsoft Windows help files are standard text formats. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the input text in one of those formats for the text translator to read, in order to make the system more versatile.

13. Claims 5, 17, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kozma in view of Chanod as applied to claims 1, 13, and 25 above, and further in view of Brown et al. (U.S 5,293,584 issued on March. 8, 1994).

Kozma teaches:

extracting external information to solve word disambiguation (as in example of col. 3, line 64);

selecting the best second phrase to be used in the translation (col. 6, lines 17-21) and determining of the “likeliest” (most probable) intended meaning” (col. 6, line 21).

However, Kozma does not teach collecting parent-phrases containing the first phrase from the additional context.

Chanond, however, teaches a system that uses hyperlinks (see rejection of claims 3, 15, and 27) to provide “access to related information” (col. 17, line 24) that could be used in “translations” (col. 17, line 21).

Kozma and Chanond are analogous art because they are from the same art of extracting information to provide text translation.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have added Chanond’s feature of using hyperlinks to collect aid information to the translation system of Kozma, in order to select the best translation for an input phrase.

Neither Kozma nor Chanond teaches determining the probability for all possible second phrases of the parent-phrases in the second language.

Brown et al., however, teach using the source sentence information to estimate the probability of a text (col. 2, lines 6-10).

Kozma, Chanond and Brown et al. are analogous art because they are from the same art of text processing.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have added the Brown et al.’s feature of determining probability to Chanond’s

Art Unit: 2654

feature of using hyperlinks and combine them with the translation system of Kozma in order to provide the user with the most accurate translation.

14. As per claims 6, 18, and 30, Kozma teaches a parsing system that is used on the input expressions (col. 3, lines 8-13) and grammar models (col. 3, line 15), a transfer lexicon or dictionary (correspondence dictionary, col. 4, lines 7-8), and a translation process as described in claims 5, 17, and 29. As a result, the steps of parsing the context containing the phrase, giving a grammatical structure of the context; f) determining the parent-phrases on the basis of combining the related grammatical components and searching a transfer lexicon; and g') constructing a temporary lexicon by corresponding entries of all the parent-phrases in the transfer lexicon to be used in one or more successive translation procedures are necessarily included in the translation process described above.

15. As per claims 7, 19, and 31, Kozma teaches analyzing a local collocation (in the example of "the mother of the boy and the orphan", col. 3, line 64, the translation system uses the phrase above as a collocation for the word "orphan" to determine its meaning). Furthermore, the examiner takes official notice that it's well known to have a translation system with an enclosed dictionary of synonyms for analyzing an input text and matching words to provide the user with the right information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have a system that uses synonym analysis to provide text translation, otherwise, the system's search process will be limited and the outcome will be not complete.

16. As per claims 8, 20, and 32, Kozma teaches a dictionary lexicon (correspondence dictionary, col. 4, lines 7-8).

Art Unit: 2654

17. As per claims 9, 21, and 33 Kozma teaches a word meaning analyzer (col. 3, lines 39-41).
18. As per claims 10, 22, and 34 Kozma teaches a sentence analyzer (col. 3, lines 29-39).
19. As per claims 11, 12, 23, 24, 35, and 36, Kozma does not teach links to context within the same or in a different web page.

Chanond, however, teaches links to online documents (col. 17, lines 25-26),

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have added Chanond's feature of using hyperlinks to the translation system of Kozma, in order to select the best translation for an input phrase.

Neither Kozma nor Chanond do specify if the link to context is within the same web page or in a different web page. The examiner takes official notice that it's well known to have information links within the same webpage or in a different webpage.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have information links within and in a different webpage to get enough information about a word or a subject.

20. As per claim 37, in addition to the rejection of claim 1, Kozma does not explicitly teach obtaining additional context from a document comprising the first text and the link related to the first text.

Chanod in the same field of endeavor teach obtaining additional context from a document comprising the first text and the link related to the first text (col. 14, line 25-30, wherein the highlighted expressions are within the same text and document and they are linked to an external HTML file).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have added Chanond's feature of extracting information through hyperlinks related to the same text to the translation system of Kozma, to have "interactive aids for consulting on-line documents" to clarify ambiguous words, as taught by Chanond (col. 17, lines 18-26).

Conclusion

21. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abdelali Serrou whose telephone number is 571-272-7638. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

Art Unit: 2654

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Talivaldis I. Smits can be reached on 571-272-7628. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

23. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A. Serrou
03/03/2006


DAVID HUDSPETH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600